

1
2
3 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
4 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

5 * * *

6 TAKISHA BROOKS,

7 Plaintiff,

8 v.

9 KEOLIS TRANSIT AMERICA, LLC

10 Defendant.
11

Case No. 2:24-cv-00900-RFB-MDC

ORDER

12 Before the Court for consideration is the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 9) of the
13 Honorable Judge Maximiliano D. Couvillier, III, United States Magistrate Judge, entered on
14 July 15, 2025. A district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in
15 part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). A
16 party may file specific written objections to the findings and recommendations of a magistrate
17 judge. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Local Rule IB 3-2(a). When written objections have been
18 filed, the district court is required to “make a de novo determination of those portions
19 of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is
20 made.” 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); see also Local Rule IB 3-2(b). Where a party fails to object,
21 however, a district court is not required to conduct “any review,” de novo or otherwise, of the
22 report and recommendations of a magistrate judge. Thomas v. Arn, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985).
23 Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2(a), objections were due by July 29, 2025. No objections have
24 been filed. The Court has reviewed the record in this case and concurs with the
25 Magistrate Judge’s recommendation.

26 ///

27 ///

28 **IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 9) is

1 **ACCEPTED** and **ADOPTED** in full.

2 **IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that this case is dismissed without prejudice.

3 The Clerk of Court is kindly requested to close this case.

4
5
6 **DATED:** August 3, 2025.

7
8 

9 **RICHARD F. BOULWARE, II**
10 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28